

XXIV.

SULTAN KHUSRAU.

By H. BEVERIDGE.

KHUSRAU was the eldest son of Jahangīr, and was born at Lahore on August 4th, 1587. His mother was the daughter of Rajah Bhagwān Dās. Her original name does not seem to be known, but after Khusrau's birth Jahangīr, or, as he then was, Prince Selīm, gave her the name of Shāh Begam. She poisoned herself with opium on May 6th, 1605,¹ on account, her husband says, of the bad behaviour of Khusrau and of one of her brothers. But there was madness in the family, and her father once tried to kill himself.

There are three interesting points connected with Khusrau. First, was he blinded by his father? Secondly, was he murdered by his half-brother, Shāh Jahān? Thirdly, what is the date of his death?

As is well known, Khusrau rebelled against his father less than six months after the latter had become king. He stole² out of Agra on a Saturday night, under the pretext that he was going to visit the tomb of his grandfather Akbar at Sikandra—Sunday being the day of the week on which Akbar was born—and fled northwards towards the Panjab. He besieged Lahore, but failed to take it, and he was defeated and captured. His father, who had pursued him, received him as a prisoner at Lahore, and inflicted cruel punishments on his followers. Khusrau himself he

¹ This is the date given by Jahangīr. According to the continuation of the Akbarnāma and the chronogram in the Khusrau Bāgh, she died in 1012 = 1603-4.

² Though Jahangīr does not say so in the Tūzuk, it appears from Price's "Jahangīr," p. 15, that Khusrau really was a prisoner in the fort of Agra. His flight, therefore, is intelligible.

put into chains and carried with him as a prisoner when, shortly afterwards, he paid a visit to Cabul. He certainly did not blind him at this time, for he tells us that when he was in the city of Cabul he ordered the chains to be taken off Khusrau's legs, and that he should be taken to see the famous Shahr Ārā garden. Nor do the authorities say that Khusrau was blinded immediately after his capture. Apparently the blinding was inflicted as a punishment for Khusrau's share in a plot to kill his father while the latter was hunting in Afghanistan. Jahangir tells us in his *Memoirs* that, though Khusrau had acted so as to deserve death, yet his fatherly affection would not allow him to inflict such punishment, and he had continued to treat him with great kindness. Now, however, it appeared that Khusrau had plotted against his father's life, and that some 500 persons had joined in the conspiracy. Among them was a son of Jahangir's future father-in-law, I'tmādu-d-daula. The plot was revealed to Shāh Jahān at Surkh-Āb, and he at once informed his father. Nūru-d-dīn, Sharif, and others were executed, and though we are not told what was done to Khusrau it cannot be doubted that his confinement became more rigorous.

There are various accounts of the manner in which Khusrau was blinded. Du Jarric, the historian of the Jesuit Missions, and who had access to the missionary reports, says that when Jahangir came to the field of battle (on his way back from Cabul?) where Khusrau had been defeated, he caused Khusrau to be blinded by applying to his eyes the juices of certain milky plants (*Euphorbias*?). William Finch says, some say Khusrau's eyes were "burnt out with a glass, though others say he was only blindfolded by having a handkerchief tied over his eyes, to which Jahangir attached his own seal." An anonymous author, quoted in Elliot & Dowson's *History of India*, vi, 448, says that a wire was applied to Khusrau's eyes and he was deprived of sight for a time, but that Jahangir afterwards repented of his cruelty and had Khusrau's eyesight restored by means of a skilful physician. After this cure Khusrau had

the full sight of one eye, but the other remained less than its natural size and was defective. Jahangīr nowhere says in his *Memoirs* that Khusrau was blinded, but a circumstance mentioned by him in the record of the fifth year of his reign seems to imply that something had been done to Khusrau's eyes. Jahangīr there tells us that in the beginning of the fifth year an impostor came to the city of Patna and made a disturbance by claiming to be Sultan Khusrau. In proof of his identity he showed marks round his eyes which he said had been caused by the application of a hot bowl to them. That this was an Eastern mode of blinding we know from a quotation by Mr. Whiteway, in his "*History of the Rise of the Portuguese Power in India*," where we are told, p. 165, that no less than fifteen relatives of the king of Ormuz were found to have been blinded by passing a red-hot bowl close to their eyes! At all events, the impostor's conduct shows that a report was current at an early period that Khusrau's eyes had been tampered with. Whether this was done effectually or not is doubtful. Sir Thomas Roe saw Khusrau and says nothing about his being blind, but then Roe could not speak the language, and so had no occasion to go close to Khusrau so as to observe him minutely.¹

As regards the second point—namely, was Khusrau murdered by Shāh Jahān?—I think that there is no evidence worthy of the name that Khusrau was poisoned or strangled. If we were to believe Indian gossip, or indeed gossip of any country in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, hardly any distinguished man of those times died a natural death. Khusrau was a broken-hearted man who had been fifteen or sixteen years in confinement. Why should we not believe Shāh Jahān's report that he had died of colic? Elphinstone, who does not accept the story of a murder, dwells on the suspicion caused by the opportuneness

¹ There is a curious passage in Price's "*Jahangīr*," p. 123, where the emperor describes himself as pardoning Khusrau at the request of Parvez, and allowing him to have hunting parties. This was in the sixteenth year, and the account implies that Khusrau was not blind then. But Price's "*Jahangīr*" is full of misstatements, and cannot be relied upon as authentic.

of Khusrāu's death. But this idea of opportuneness is partly due to a wrong chronology. Jahangīr's illness began in the fifteenth year of his reign at the time of the Dasahra, i.e. in October, 1620, when he was in Cashmere. He recovered, but after he had crossed the mountains the illness returned with increased severity. This was in the beginning of the sixteenth year. But Jahangīr made a second recovery, and Nūr Jahān gave a feast to celebrate his convalescence and also the occurrence of his 51st birthday. This was in Shawwāl, 1030, or September, 1621. Jahangīr's son Parvez heard of his father's illness, and came all the way from Bihar to visit him. But he did not arrive till the 14th Mihr or near the end of September and about three weeks after Nūr Jahān's banquet. I suppose Elphinstone had authority for the statement that Jahangīr was displeased with Parvez for coming, and sent him back with a reprimand. But the authority cannot, I think, be a good one, for it is contradictory to what Jahangīr himself says. Jahangīr, according to his own account, was pleased with Parvez's affection and solicitude, but he deprecated Parvez's taking the burden of the illness upon himself by pacing three times round his father. He did not send Parvez away at once, but kept him till he reached Mathura on his return journey to Agra. It was not till 26th Aban, or about 14th November, that Jahangīr sent Parvez back to Bihar. Elphinstone supposes that Khusrāu suddenly died in Shāh Jahān's custody at the opportune time, viz. September, 1621, when Jahangīr was ill. But, as a fact, Khusrāu did not die till the 29th January, 1622, or about the end of the sixteenth year of the reign. If Khusrāu was blind, or of defective sight, there was little object in putting him out of the way, especially as he was completely in Shāh Jahān's power. It seems to be forgotten, too, that there was another barrier between Shāh Jahān and the throne—which also was not vacant—namely, Shah Parvez, who was older than Shāh Jahān, and had the advantage of being born of a Muhammadan mother!

It is true that in the Bib. Ind. edition of Khāfi Khān, vol. i, 325, Ghairat (wrongly printed 'Izzat) Khān, the

author of the *Jahāngīrnāma*, is quoted as stating that *Khusrau* was poisoned. If this were correct it would be strong evidence, for *Ghairat Khān* is the *Kāmgār Ḥusainī* of Rieu's Catalogue, I, 257*a*, and his work, there called the *Maasir Jahāngīri*, is a valuable contemporary record. But the reference to *Ghairat Khān* does not occur in all the manuscripts of *Khāfi Khān*. In two of those in the British Museum, Add. 26,223 and Add. 26,226, *Ghairat Khān* or the *Jahāngīrnāma* is not mentioned as the authority; and, moreover, no such statement as that attributed to *Ghairat Khān* appears to exist in his work. *Khāfi Khān*'s remark occurs in his account of the sixteenth year of *Jahangīr*'s reign, that being the year in which *Khusrau* died, and naturally *Ghairat Khān*'s statement about the poisoning should occur in his narrative of the same year. But in two MSS. of his work which I have examined, viz., I.O. MS. 324 of *Ethé*'s Catalogue and B.M. MS. Or. 171, Rieu, I, 257*a*, nothing is said about *Khusrau*'s having been poisoned. All we have there is the same statement as in the *Tūzuk* and the *Iqbāl-nāma*, viz., that *Khusrau* was reported to have died of colic. It is also most improbable that *Ghairat Khān* would make such a statement, for he was a favoured servant of *Shāh Jahān*, and got his title from him. I think, therefore, that if the passage was really written by *Khāfi Khān*, and is not the work of some copyist, it is only one of the many mistakes of a not very accurate historian.

As regards the third point, namely, the date of *Khusrau*'s death, I think we must accept the statements of *Mu'tamad Khān* and *Ghairat Khān* that it took place on 20th Bahman, 1031, which corresponds to 29th January, 1622, o.s. *Mu'tamad Khān*, the author of the *Iqbāl-nāma*, had excellent means of knowing, for he was the *Bakhshī*, or paymaster, of the army of the Deccan, and presumably was at *Burhān-pūr* at the time of the death. It is true that *Jahangīr* says, according to *Sayid Aḥmād*'s text, that the death occurred on the 8th of a month which is not specified, but which, according to the context, should be *Isfāndarmuz*, that is, the month following Bahman. But two India Office

MSS. of the Tūzuk have 20th instead of 8th, and if so the date must refer to the previous month (Bahman), for the news reached Jahangīr on or before the 19th Isfāndarmuz. Even if we accept the 8th Isfāndarmuz (Blochmann has the 18th!¹) as the date, the period of eleven days would be too short for the news to reach Jahangīr. He was then on the Jhīlam, at or near the borders of Cashmere, and the death occurred in the Deccan. When Jahangīr himself died, the news was sent off in hot haste to Shāh Jahān by a Hindu named Banārasī, famous for his celerity. He, too, started from the borders of Cashmere, and it was considered a marvellous feat when he reached Shāh Jahān at Junnar,² in the Deccan, in the course of twenty days. It is further south than Burhānpūr, but to a courier like Banārasī this part of the journey would not take more than three or four days. As showing that it would be impossible in those days for letters to arrive from Burhānpūr, at the borders of Cashmere, in eleven days, it may be mentioned that Jahangīr records, in his Memoirs of the second year of his reign, that an important piece of news was conveyed to him at Cabul from Kandahar in the course of twelve days. Evidently he considered this very rapid. Mr. Foster, the indefatigable editor of Indian correspondence, also informs me that there is a Burhānpūr letter dated February 5th, 1622, which speaks of the death of Khusrau as a recent event. It is therefore certain that Khusrau died in the end of January or beginning of February.

¹ Beale, in the *Miftāhu-t-tawārīkh*, gives the date as 9th Bahman or 13th Rabiul-awwal.

² There is, or at least was, a little uncertainty as to where Shāh Jahān was when Banārasī brought him the news of his father's death, for the authorities, or, at all events, the manuscript copies of their works, mention two places besides Junair. Mr. Blochmann, in his interesting article in the *Calcutta Review* for October, 1869, apparently considers that Shāh Jahān was then at some place north of the Taptī, and between it and the Narbada. It is, however, Junair (Junnar) in Kāngār Husainī's book, B.M. MS. Or. 171 (Rieu, i, 257), and in a MS. of the *Majālisu-s-Salātīn*, which was composed in the year after Jahangīr's death, it is stated that at the time of Jahangīr's death Shāh Jahān was at Junair, "a place three months' journey from the imperial camp" (see also Elliot, vii, 137). Manucci, too, as Mr. Irvine informs me, states that Shāh Jahān used to live at Junair. It seems, therefore, to be certain that Shāh Jahān was at Junair when the news reached him.

To many persons, perhaps, the most interesting circumstance associated with Khusrāu is that his rebellion led indirectly to the development of the Sikh religion. Arjūn Mal, the fifth Gūrū of the Sikhs, waited upon Khusrāu when the latter halted near his residence (Goīndwāl ?¹) and placed a saffron finger-mark (*qashqa* = *likā*) on his forehead, etc. Jahangīr was offended at this and arrested Arjūn, and according to his own account (*Tūzūk*, p. 34) caused him to be put to death. The Sikh tradition, however, is that Arjūn escaped by diving into the Ravi. His tomb is still to be seen in Lahore. Jahangīr's reference to Arjūn and his tenets is probably the earliest Persian notice of the Sikh religion. At all events it is considerably earlier than the *Dabistan*, which is so often quoted by Cunningham. To a pious Sikh, Jahangīr's contemptuous reference to Arjūn and his doctrines must appear to be just such a palmary passage as that which the Christian, and indeed all after-time, finds in the few words in which Tacitus describes the rise of the Christian religion and the ignominious death of its Founder.

I am indebted to Mr. Richard Burn, I.C.S., for the following inscriptions from the Khusrāu Bāgh near Allahabad. Almost all of them were published as long ago as 1849 by Thomas William Beale in his valuable work called the *Miftāḥu-t-tawārikh* ("The Key to Chronicles"), but his book was published at Agra and is in Persian, and has long been out of print. In Murray's *Handbook for Bengal*, etc., ed. 1882, pp. 363-4, there is a rhymed translation of the inscriptions by Eastwick. Very likely Eastwick, though he does not say so, took the inscriptions from Beale's book (see p. 334, etc., of Beale in the account of Khusrāu). The seventh line of Khusrāu's inscription is not given in Mr. Burn's copy, and I have supplied it from Beale. The language of the inscriptions is rather difficult, and I am not sure that my translation is always correct, although I have had the valuable assistance of Sir Charles Lyall.

¹ Called Goīndwāl by Cunningham.

SHĀH BEGAM'S TOMB.

بیگم کہ ز عصمت رخ رحمت آراست - اقلیم عدم ز نور عزت آراست
 سبحان اللہ زہے کمال عفت - کز حسن عمل چہرہ جت آراست

چون چرخ فلک ز گردش خود آشفست - در زیر زمین آئینہ مہر بنہفت
 تاریخ وفات شاد بیگم جست - از غیب ملک بخلد شد بیگم گفت

۱۰۱۲ ہجری

TRANSLATION OF INSCRIPTION ON THE TOMB OF SHĀH BEGAM, THE
 MOTHER OF KHUSRAU.

The Lady whose purity adorned the cheek of gentleness
 Adorned Death's realm by the light of her honour.
 God be praised! Hail to perfect purity,
 Which by well-doing adorns the face of Paradise!

When the Sphere waxed indignant at its own turning
 The Sun's mirror hid itself under ground.
 I sought out the date of Shāh Begam's death:
 An angel's voice said, *Ba khuld shud Begam*.

The translation is doubtful, especially in the second line of the last quatrain. 'Āyina mihr' is *āyina khūd* in Beale, p. 335. Perhaps the 'mirror' is in allusion to the fact that the representation of a mirror is generally carved on the tomb of a Muhammadan woman. The meaning may be that, as the sphere, or spheres, was grieved at the mutability of things, so the Begam who was, as it were, the sun's mirror, hid herself under the earth. The chronogram in the last line, *Ba khuld shud Begam*, 'The Begam went to Paradise,' yields, according to *abjad*, 1012 A.H., thus agreeing with the Akbarnāma. Jahangir gives, in his Memoirs, the date as the 26th of the last month of 1013, which corresponds to 6th May, 1605. Probably he, or his copyist, is wrong by a year, and the true date is 26th Zil-Hajja, 1012, or 16th May, 1604.

KHUSRAU'S TOMB.

آه و افسوس آسمان را سیرت بیداد شد -
 آرے آرے کارچون برظلم آمد داد شد
 زندگی زد خیمه بیرون ازدیار خرمی -
 دید چون بنیاد عالم را خراب آباد شد
 اهل و اباش اند آگاه از فلک کاحداث او -
 هر کجاذد شعله خاکستر و بر باد شد
 گلبنی هر جاکه بینی برگ ریزاندر پی است -
 بلبل این باغ بودن مصلحت از یاد شد
 گلغذارے را طراوت چیست کاخر خاک مرگ -
 از پئے چاک قباصد سوزن فولاد شد
 چون بلب رانم حدیثے را که میسوزد بآه -
 مشکل است امّا جهان تاهست این معتاد شد
 آن گل رعنا که بود آرائے گلشن صدریخ -
 عندلیبان را برنگ و بوئے او دل شاد شد
 چاک پیرا هن شد از خسار قضا در باغ عمر -
 هم زمین بگریست و هم از آسمان فریاد شد
 شد قبا بر قامت مردم قبا در ماتمش -
 شاه خسرو را بسوئے خلد چون ارشاد شد
 آن تن نازک که بروے بود پیرا هن گران -
 در ته خاک جفا افسوس استعداد شد

شد غریق رحمت حق چون ولّی پاک بود -
 خاص درگاه خدا و همدم او تاد شد
 معلّمی ارشد سال فوتش فیض لائق بازگو -
 صفّه جنت زجان پاک او آباد شد

۱۰۳۱ هجری

TRANSLATION OF THE INSCRIPTION ON Khusrāu's Tomb.

Alas and alas for the unjust ways of Heaven!
 Woe, woe when Justice left and Tyranny arrived!
 Life pitched her tent outside the land of Joy¹
 When she saw the world's foundation² made desolate.
 Lord³ and loon are familiar with Heaven's dealings.
 Where'er the spark strikes, ashes and ruin follow.
 Where'er you see a rose-tree, there are falling leaves.
 The nightingale forgot that such was Life's garden (?).
 What freshness has the rosy cheek if at last Death's thorn
 Become the steel of a hundred needles on entering the slit of
 the raiment?
 When I bring the story on my lips and they burn with sighs
 'Tis hard; but while the world is, such things are usual.
 Alas, alas for the beauteous flower, the pride of the parterre,
 In whose hue and scent the soul of the nightingale rejoiced!
 Her garment was rent in Life's garden by the thorn of Fate.
 Earth wept, and there was a lament from the Sky.
 Men tore their garments in grief for him.
 When Shāh Khusrāu wended his way to eternity.
 The delicate frame, to which the tunic was a burden,
 Became rigid under the cruel earth, alas, alas!

¹ *Khurramī*. Mr. Burn thinks there may be an allusion here to Shāh Jahān, who was called Khurram.

² Perhaps this is an allusion to the word Khusrāu's meaning the Sun (it is the same word as Cyrus).

³ Beale has *ahl-i-ūbāsh* instead of *ahl u ūbāsh*. If so, the meaning is 'people in general.'

When he, pure saint, sank in the ocean of God's mercy,
 He became in the Divine Courts an associate of Archangels.¹
 O Salmā,² would you know the date of death, say " *Faiz Lāiq*,"
 And "His pure soul has graced the terraces of Paradise."

THE TOMB OF KHUSRAU'S SISTER SULTANU-NISĀ BEGAM.

اوپر شمال کی طرف
 روقطع تعلق بکن امروز کہ فردا -
 آسودہ ز اغلال وایمین زسلاسل
 از خود گذرلے یار و بدو رس کہ کی نیست -
 غیر از تو میان تو و مقصود تو حائل
 دکن دروازه پر
 گرہمہ مملکت وصال جہان جمع کنیم -
 مابجز پیرہنے ہیچ زدنیہ نبریم
 بادشاہا تو کریمی ورحیمی وغفور -
 دست ماگیر کہ درماندہ وبے بال وپریم
 در شوارع دین کوہ صفت سنگی وکاہل -
 تن دہ برضا کانچہ قضا برتونوشت است -
 از تو نشود دفع بہ تعویز وحمائل
 حق را بشناس از نظر چشم ودل وگوشت -
 کاین کہ ہمہ بر قدرت حق اند دلائل

¹ *Autād*, literally tent-pegs, or props.

² Salmā is a common name for a mistress, and seems to be so used here, though apparently Eastwick regarded it as meaning 'Ask'st thou.' The chronogram *faiz lāiq* yields 1031 = 1622, and so also does the last line. Khusrāu was born on 24th Amardād, 995, or 4th August, 1587, and as he died in the end of January, 1622, he was about 34½ years old at his death. His birth is recorded in the *Akbarnāma*, iii, 523.

TRANSLATION OF INSCRIPTIONS ON TOMB OF KHUSRAU'S
SISTER.¹

(*On the north side.*)

To-day remove thy face from the world, that to-morrow
Thou mayst rest from entanglements and be freed from chains.
Quit thyself, O friend, and draw nigh to Him, for
Betwixt thee and thy goal nought intervenes but self.

(*On the south side.*)

If we gather all the possessions and wealth of the world,
We'll take nought with us save a shroud.
O King, thou art gracious, merciful, and the Pardoner;
Take our hands, for we are aweary and wingless.

In expounding the Faith, I (?)² am ignorant and like a stone.

Resign thyself, for what Fate decrees for thee must happen.
Do not take refuge in amulets and charms;
Acknowledge God with eye, heart, and ear,
For all of these are proofs of Divine power.

Beale's words, p. 335, are:—"The tomb, which is in the middle of the garden and opposite the great gate, is said to be that of Sultan Khusrāu's sister. She had built this tomb for herself in 1034, but, as she died elsewhere, the

¹ Her name was Sultan Nisā Begam, and she was the eldest of Jahangir's children. She was Khusrāu's full sister, and was born about a year and a half before him. Her birth is recorded in the Akbarnāma, iii, 493. She was born on the eve of the 16th Ardibihisht, 994, corresponding to about 26th April, 1586. According to the chronogram, *Rauza pāk*, "The pure lawn (or cemetery)," she died in 1034 (1624-5). Her name, according to some authorities, was Sultan Niṣār Begam. Her mother was a daughter of Rajah Bhagwān Dās, and so is regarded as a sister of Rajah Mān Singh, though it appears that the latter was only the adopted son of Rajah Bhagwan, and was originally his nephew. Beale does not give the verses which appear in Mr. Burn's copy of the inscriptions. Sultan Niṣār predeceased her father, who died in 1037 (1627). It is said that two of Khusrāu's sons are also buried in the Khusrāu Bāgh.

² The second line of this stanza is missing. Beale states that there is a small tomb to the west of the others, and that it is not known whose it is. Some say it is the tomb of Bibi Tambūlin, while others say it is Jodh Bai's. Eastwick speaks of there being a cenotaph in the Khusrāu Bāgh of Nūr Jahān. According to Beale, Jahangir built the wall round the garden with the surplus of the materials for the Allahabad Fort.

tomb is empty. There are many verses inside the dome, but some of them have become defaced." The first line of the verses is:

خورم آنروز کر ما رخت ازین خانه بریم

Happy the day when we move our goods from this house.

The chronogram is in front of the door of the tomb, but the first stanza has become effaced. The other two stanzas are:

برد ملایک رحمت اسمیشہ نور نثار -

زہی نمونہ خلد برین بمرکز خاک

خرد زسال بنایش بصفہ فکرت -

نوشت باقلم اخترع روضہ پاک

I am unable to translate the first line. Perhaps there is an allusion to the lady's name, which, according to some authorities, was Sultan Nişār. The translation of the other three lines is:

Hail to the model of Paradise upon the earth!

Wisdom wrote on Thought's terrace the year of building

With the pen of invention, (saying) "Rauṣa¹ pāk."

¹ The 'chaste tomb.' The words yield 1034, or 1625. I may here note that, though Mr. Keene translated and edited Beale's work, he omitted the chronograms. It seems a pity that Beale's work has not been reprinted. I presume that he was an Eurasian. He must have been a good Persian scholar. He died at Agra, says Mr. Keene, at a very advanced age, in the summer of 1875. He was only a clerk in the office of the Board of Revenue at Agra, but, like Taylor of Dacca, Christian of Bihar, and Haji Mustafa, the translator of the *Siyar Mutākherin*, he has left more permanently useful work than many highly placed officials. Elliot's History of India fitly closes with a notice of Mr. Beale's work. It is to be hoped that his burial-place is known, and that it has a tombstone. Eastwick (Murray's Handbook, 292) notices the tomb of a Catherine Beale who died in August, 1857.